

The Examiner asserted at page 2 of the Office Action that Tajima teaches a guide bush (17), a carrying member (16), and a "pressing member causing an elastic displacement." The Examiner did not, however, identify which structure of Tajima is the alleged "pressing member." The only possible structures left as candidates for the "pressing member" are regulating screw 20 and fixing screws 103. But neither have the requisite relative motion to the carrying member that is required by independent claims 1 and 18.

Moreover, the Examiner admits at pages 3-4 of the Office Action that Tajima fails to disclosed any "feed screw structure," much less the feed screw structure required by these claims:

Tajima does not teach an adjusting mechanism capable of adjusting a radial dimension of material support section of the guide bush, a pressing member movable relative to the carrying member and able to make a relative linear motion along a guiding axis relative to a guide bush, in a radial direction on a material support section by a relative linear motion, a feed screw structure causing relative linear motion between a pressing member and a guide bush by a mutual screwing motion of threads, a manipulation section disposed near a front face of the carrying member at a position remote from a material introducing end of a guide bush, capable of manipulate [sic] a feed screw structure to cause motion, a feed screw structure is between a carrying member and a pressing member, a carrying member has an internal thread, a pressing member has an external thread adapted to be screw [sic] on an internal thread to constitute a feed screw structure, a carrying member has an external thread, a pressing member has an internal thread adapted to be screw [sic] on an external thread to constitute a feed screw structure, and manipulating member disposed near a front face of a carrying member and adjacent to a pressing member, a feed screw structure is provided between a carrying member and a manipulating member, a feed screw structure is provided between a pressing member and a guide bush.

To remedy this deficiency, the Examiner relies upon Evenson, which discloses "Quick-Connect Fasteners for Assembling Devices in Space." There is, however, no evidence Applicants can find that the "Guide Bush for Automatic Lathe," of Tajima has

need for a quick connect fastener, much less one that is intended for use in space. It is difficult to see a connection between the Tajima and Evenson references that would lead one skilled in the art to rely on the teachings of Evenson to modify Tajima in any manner, much less in a manner that would result in rendering the subject matter of claims 1 and/or 18 obvious.

In support of her obviousness rejection, the Examiner notes at page 4 of the Office Action that "threads are old and well-known mechanical structures utilized to facilitate movement between two corresponding devices. Threads also provide a locking means, when the structures are immobile increasing the safety of the device." While this may be true, for as can be seen in Tajima regulating nut 20 seems to meet these criteria, there is no basis to conclude that just because threads are old, the positioning of the threads to create the "feed screw structure" of claims 1 and 18 would be obvious.

By positioning and configuring a "guide bush," "carrying member," "pressing member," and "feed screw structure" in a manner required by claims 1 and 18, Applicants have achieved the objective of providing a material guide device for an automatic lathe that can easily adjust the radial dimension of a material support section of a guide bush with high precision, using a structure capable of preventing an increase in the size and the cost of the device. There is nothing in Evenson that even remotely suggests replacing the regulating nut 20 or fixing screws 103 of Tajima with the "pressing member" of claims 1 or 18, and/or adding a "feed screw structure" as is also required by those claims. It is only, Applicants respectfully submit, through the improper

use of hindsight that the Examiner can find any connection whatsoever, no matter how remote, between the teachings of Tajima and Evenson

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 18, and claims 2-17 and 19 depending there from are not obvious over Tajima in view of Everson.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 9, 2009

By: 

John M. Romary
Reg. No. 26,331

1977295_1.DOCX